

**SPECIAL MEETING
BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN
(PUBLIC PARTICIPATION)**

May 20, 2003

7:00 PM

Mayor Baines called the meeting to order.

Mayor Baines called for the Pledge of Allegiance, this function being led by Alderman Forest.

A moment of silent prayer is observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Wihby, Gatsas, Guinta, Sysyn, Osborne (late), Pinard,
O’Neil, Lopez, Shea, DeVries, Garrity, Smith, Thibault, Forest

Mayor Baines advised that the purpose of the special meeting is to give residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the Board on items of concern affecting the community; that each person will be given only one opportunity to speak; that comments shall be limited to two minutes to allow all participants the opportunity to speak and any comments must be directed to the Chair.

Mayor Baines requested that any resident wishing to speak come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized, and give their comments.

Harold Levine, 49 Hillcroft Road, Ward 2, stated reading this morning’s paper about the six percent increase in the tax rate, you’re looking for more on how to save money for the taxpayers of Manchester. A lot of the aldermen I’ve given this particular...some of the ideas that I have and I’d like you to look at it too Mr. Mayor. I think over the years I’ve discussed some of these items with you. I feel there’s a lot of fat to be cut in this particular budget. It seems that the residential taxpayers of Manchester are really getting zonked. You’ve got a certain formula for the big land lots and the commercial properties are getting all kinds of deals. I understand Hampshire Plaza 30 years ago, they’re still paying the same tax rate and you’ve got other buildings. Now I think it’s about time we stop subsidizing these big investors and start thinking about the residential taxpayers who need this. Also, I think to me this was in the Union Leader a week from Saturday, and I called this the rape of the City of Manchester once again and it was all caused by the last administration. This building I believe was not put up on bid, but was given to present landlords who own this particular building. It seems as though it was no good when I spoke to the ex-Mayor that there was a

bleachery there at one time but it was not good enough for offices for the City of Manchester but it seems it might be good enough for the present owners and I think this is where we rape the taxpayer's money once again.

Fred Matuszewski, 2366 Elm Street, stated thank you Your Honor and the board. I'm a partner in the architectural firm of CMK Architects Professional Association, also known as CMK. My architectural firm has been under contract to the City a number of times for various academic and municipal projects included of late are the new fire stations at Somerville Street, Engine 7, and at East Industrial Park Drive, Engine 8, and the expansion and renovation of the library media center at Manchester Memorial High School, and Families in Transition, which had received some funding participation from the City. Tonight, however, I represent the NH Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, a statewide organization of registered architects, associates, and affiliate members representing the design and construction community of New Hampshire. Tonight you will hear placed before you for consideration an ordinance identified as a responsible employer ordinance. As a former director, treasurer, and president of AIANH, I've been asked by the directors to represent them in the presentation of this statement. AIA recommends that you, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, reject this responsible employer ordinance. As in my testimony of one year ago, I stated the City was ill prepared to provide appropriate monitoring of this ordinance and its compliance by contractors, their subcontractors, vendors, and subsequent tier involved in construction of City projects. That situation remains unchanged. AIANH's position remains unchanged and again this year the organization recommends rejection of this ordinance tonight. If, however, the Board of Mayor and Aldermen chooses to refer this to committee, I strongly urge you to provide the community opportunity for public input and testimony in the debate of this ordinance.

Kevin Lefebvre, 16 Depot Street, Weare, stated I'm with On-time Electric. There is an article coming up, the responsible employers ordinance. I'm not in favor of this because of certain things in the article that I feel are kind of vague and maybe already been overruled. One of them is number 2, and it states "must we enter into an agreement with a partnership program of some sort recognized by the state", and what is that the Department of Labor, State Apprenticeship Council. If it is with the State Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, that has been overruled at a Jay Kall meeting a year or so ago due to the fact that it mandates you to enter into a voluntary agreement with the State. It's a City ordinance. Are you superceding the State law? And if so, who is going to enforce it if there is a problem between the State law and the City's interpretation of it? And there's also an issue of the department that would oversee all of the records of the apprenticeship training. Who would take care of the paperwork? Who would pay for all of the paperwork to be taken care of? I'm just stating the facts. Now I've been here before, we were here last year when this came up. It wasn't a good ordinance then, it's still not a good ordinance, and I thank you very much for your time.

Henry Szumiesz, 25 Eastern Avenue, Concord, stated I'm here really to represent my mom who is blessed with the opportunity to retire this coming summer. She's a property owner on 238 Alsace Street here in Manchester, and as a retired person I'm sure her income is going to be pretty well fixed for the future. And listening to the first gentleman that spoke about taxes going up six percent, when you look at responsible ordinances, responsible employers ordinances, and what they're trying to do with this language, it's going to definitely bring costs on construction in Manchester. I'm sure that with everything else that you gentlemen and ladies are fighting over the budget, I'm sure you don't need something else to tackle. So my suggestion is hopefully that you'll hear everyone else that speaks also the same thought, that is just put this thing back to bed where it was when it was killed a year ago. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

Ken Holmes, 275 Old Province Road, Newbury, stated I am here this evening as the principal and general manager of North Branch Construction, one of the oldest and largest general contractors and construction managers in the State of New Hampshire, having been incorporated in 1958 and having construction revenues of almost \$40 million. I am here to speak to you regarding the responsible employer ordinance that I understand has been submitted to you for consideration. Let me make it clear that North Branch Construction is indeed a responsible employer. We employ 60 people, we make available a myriad of benefits to our people, not the least of which is medical, dental, disability, and life insurance, plus 401K, at a cost to the company last year of approximately \$250,000. We also provide and pay for initial and continuous training of all of our people. North Branch has traditionally worked both in the City of Manchester and for the City of Manchester. Recent construction projects completed in the City include Somerville Fire Station, Engine 7 and Millyard II, Families in Transition, both of which received Manchester historic preservation awards. As a firm we do not understand the need for this ordinance. While at first it may appear to simply require contractors to do what all quality firms are doing anyway. Further examination of the ordinance, however, clearly suggests its purpose is more questionable. There is language requiring certified payroll records be produced when in fact the ordinance does not have any particular payroll requirements associated with it. One can only guess as to what this provision is designed to accomplish. Perhaps most disturbing to a general contractor is the language related to the liability accepted by a general contractor for any alleged violations of any of it's subcontractors which presumably carries all the way down the tiers to subcontractors, subcontractors, and vendors as well. Frankly the liability issues in this ordinance alone are sufficient to prevent North Branch from participating in future City work. But what is much more important to you and the other citizens of this City, is that the ordinance would significantly increase the bureaucracy and cost to the taxpayer of performing construction work for the City of Manchester. For this reason, I encourage you to reject consideration of this ordinance.

Chet Cilley, 25B Cardinal Lane, Laconia, stated I'm here to represent the ECBA which is Electrical Contractors Business Association, with members of over 50 electrical contractors in the State, many one man shops, many more. Again we are speaking that we would consider that you would not reconsider the responsible employers ordinance. I work for Rudolph Electric. I'm a vice-president. I've been with the company almost 40 years. We worked in Manchester before. We've done the MBTA garage, we did the preliminary on the Mall of NH, and also did the Police station. I can't see any changes to be done and I don't think this act is great.

Ned McElroy, 1 Valley West Way, stated I'm a citizen of Manchester and I'm here on two levels. One as a citizen concerned about the taxes in the City and recent published raises in taxes and I'm here to be against this ordinance. I'm also a contractor and I own JM Electrical and have done contracts with the City of Manchester in the past and I'm concerned with the language of the responsible employer ordinance. As a responsible employer myself I offer comprehensive insurance. I'm concerned about the language written in this ordinance that would require additional insurances to be added in my company which would then price me out of the markets outside the City of Manchester. It may limit me to the ability to even bid contracts in the future with Manchester and being a taxpayer and a citizen, that concerns me that I might be kept out of the loop because of what the details may be in this ordinance itself. So as a concerned taxpayer I urge that you reject this responsible employer ordinance once again and leave the free market as will be.

Paul DeLorie, 9 Heather Lane, Bow, stated I am Vice-President of Hampshire Fire Protection. We're one of the largest fire sprinkler companies in New England. We've been fortunate to do many projects for the City of Manchester and look forward to many more. However, we question the veracity of that future work if we would have to be in compliance with the proposed responsible ordinance. We do not support the ordinance based on its compliance and penalties. We are a responsible employer. We do support the goals of providing health care, classification of employees, and employee training. We provide all of those benefits in training and health care for our employees. We have over 100 employees and many of them do reside in Manchester. If we are to have to try and comply with these proposed administrative hurdles it will drive up our cost, those costs will be passed onto you, and it will essentially limit our willingness to participate in City projects, ultimately it will limit free enterprise, and it will restrict our opportunities, and it will not be pro business or pro labor, it will be non-enterprise. I support healthcare, so please table this and cancel it like you did last year.

Billy Dodd, 181 Mammoth Road, stated there was an interesting article in the paper last Friday in the City Hall section about Comcast wanting to occupy the old Raytheon building and bring in 500-700 jobs and their dangling a carrot about they're going to move Channel 96 down to where it should be which this board should have taken AT&T to court for breach

of contract for putting it way up there. It seems that the Planning Board and probably the Destination Coordinator knew about them coming, but I find it hard to understand how the corner office didn't know anything about them coming up. But Comcast is a monopoly and you guys allow it to happen and AT&T inflated their prices back around the first of the year when they changed the programming schedule and it costs a lot more money now to get the same channels you used to get and Comcast wants you to give them a five-year extension. If they're going to move their corporate office and repair shops and what have you to the Raytheon building, they're doing it because it makes good financial sense to them. Don't give them another five-year extension. Start looking around for another cable company to come in here and give them some competition. That will bring the prices down. The other thing, the ballpark seems to be the snowball rolling down the hill that you can't stop. There will probably be a pretty good venture down there, but all of you people here need to open your eyes a little more. There was an article in the paper the other week about Toronto has their agreement with New Haven Ravens through next year. So you guys shouldn't be approving any more deals on the buildings down there or the ballpark or anything until you have the Toronto Blue Jays signing off on a 20-year affiliation with us. You have the Pawtucket Red Sox signed off and you have major league baseball. You guys need to get those things in place before you start doing a lot of other things. Keep those things in mind. The parking garage, the last thing that you want to sell down here. It seems like you've got somebody telling you what it's worth and you're telling them what it's worth, and you own it. Well Mr. Dillon has told you that half of his revenue with the airport comes from parking. I think maybe you ought to put the parking garages in his control and let him make some money with them.

Doug Grant, 116 Hollis Street, stated I'm here as a member of the Granite State Organizing Project, which we will call GSOP for short. It's a consortium of 38 religious, labor and community groups focused in Manchester, including six Manchester congregations. We're working for the whole community on issues of jobs, housing, education, and health care. We support the responsible employer ordinance because it is good for the whole community. We arranged five meetings between Mark Holden and supporters of the ordinance during the past year. During this time the ordinance changed quite a bit from what you saw a year ago based on Mr. Holden's objections. There was quite a lot of negotiation. Both sides agree on the problem; training, insurance, and independent contractors. In addition, GSOP has met with over half the Aldermen and gotten support from all but one of them on this issue. We consider that there are only minor areas of disagreement remaining to be worked out and we believe that working them out in this committee is the appropriate way to do it. Thank you very much.

Mark Holden, 14 Dixon Avenue, stated I'm President of Associated Builders and Contractors. I represent about 170 commercial contractors working throughout the State of New Hampshire, including the City of Manchester. As you just heard, we have been represented on a committee of the GSOP for the past several months and have had a number

of very productive meetings. We certainly appreciate the goals of prequalification and encouraging responsible employment practices. We think there's been some progress and certainly some significant language changes. If any of you recall the product you had in front of you last year relative to a responsible employer ordinance. However, I think that to sort of simplify the situation, there's the goals of the responsible employer ordinance, access to healthcare, training initiatives, the proper classification of employees, and then there's the compliance and enforcement aspects of it. And while we did have some success in discussing and having some changes to the goals of the ordinance relative to compliance and enforcement, there were a lot of very sticky issues and Associated Builders and Contractors still has a number of questions and concerns with that. Quite frankly we're not sure and question the possibility of even being able to come up with some compliance and enforcement procedures that are practical, productive, and would provide the City of Manchester with cost effective construction services. Some vague questions that you really want to consider are how can contractors demonstrate and sustain compliance with the ordinance as proposed without incurring time and increased administrative costs which will be passed on to the City? Also, will the City of Manchester monitor and enforce provisions without incurring time and increased administrative costs? Why would certified payroll records be requested when there are no established rates of pay to be verifying? Will the increased cost to the City of Manchester provide a return on investment and increase quality and productivity? Will this accomplish this goal? Will the administrative provisions discourage some contractors from currently performing satisfactorily for the City from bidding future work for the City of Manchester? We encourage you to seriously consider the issues relative to this and it's impact and if you have any questions or comments, I certainly will be able to answer those.

Steven Rancourt, 7 McGrath Road, Pelham, stated I'm a small, medium sized electrical contractor in the State of New Hampshire and I'm here to speak on behalf of the responsible employers act. I'm here to voice my opposition to the act being passed and I have a few questions and concerns about this act. As an electrical contractor, we hire high voltage subcontractors, fire alarm subcontractors, telephone, data subcontractors, concrete cutting and coring subcontractors, trenching and paving subcontractors. Why does the City want to review and approve all of these subcontractors who specialize in a certain task? You could have approximately 35 to 40 subcontractors on each project for every project going on in the City. What's the purpose of that and the benefit to the taxpayers? Who would be overseeing this office if there's any problems? What department and who would you go to in the department? Who will end up paying for this cumbersome procedure? I would assume the taxpayers and again if so, what is the benefit to them for having this go on? Do they gain anything whatsoever from this procedure and this act? Why is this act strictly for contractors or subcontractors and not for every restaurant, bar, hotel, clothing store, or business in the City of Manchester? And why would it only benefit the City if it is applied to contractors and not the rest of the businesses in the City? Again, what's the main reason for this act? What's the purpose of it? Why shouldn't every business follow the act even though not all

of the rules pertain to them and the ordinance concerning their business or whatever parts do? Any additional cost for this act as well as the cost involved to enforce it would ultimately be passed on to the consumer and to us as a subcontractor. I urge you to reject this ordinance on behalf of the taxpayers of Manchester and subcontractors.

Howie Howe, 525 Wilson Street, stated I happen to be a candidate for Mayor. With the recent announcement of a probable six percent tax increase, City leadership is once again facing criticism over whether the budgets they propose must accept to the actions of responsible persons. Partisan politics will lead many to think that things would be different if only others were sitting in your chairs, but we all know that's hogwash. To those of us with a clear and focused mind we know the truth. Simply put, providing public services costs money and costs will never go down. Whoever has to approve those budgets is wrong even when they have no alternative. However, while great focus will be made to ensure that tax money is not spent on any project to excess, it seems maybe we're not considering all of the possible revenue generating activities that should be available in the City. I certainly don't want to make Manchester any more business unfriendly, but there are revenue sources available from licensing programs and other activities within the City that should be pursued. Bureaucratic red tape, departmental self interest must be put aside for the good of the taxpayers. In the next few months I'll be providing to you several revenue producing ideas some of which I've presented to some of these board members in the past, but I've seen no action on. Taking advantage of such available revenue sources can lessen the burden on the taxpayers in this City and that is what the people want and deserve. Ladies and gentlemen this year you're elected to take the blame for increased property taxes. Whether you approach this with an oh well manner or whether to do it with hey what can we do to lessen the burden on the taxpayers and leave a telltale difference between our philosophies of leadership. To me the choice is clear. We need more money from people other than the taxpayers.

Richard Duby, 19 Port Chester Drive, Nashua, stated I do work as an independent contractor in the Greater Manchester area. I will keep this brief. There should be no ordinance for responsible employers.

Rich Lambert, 23 Summer Snow Lane, Bedford, stated I've worked for ProCon Construction for 23 years. I'm Vice-President in charge of operations. We have over 150 employees and of those a good percentage of them are Manchester residents and I've been asked to speak...I'm also a member of ABC and AGC...about this responsible ordinance. The feeling is the responsible employee ordinance hasn't worked in Massachusetts where they have plenty of money. Around here where we're having problems with the schools out there, I believe you have \$100 million budget, I can assure you for an example this ordinance was in place, you would get probably \$85 million worth of work in place or you would have to go back to the taxpayers to get another \$15 million. This has been proven, this is facts about this particular program. The other thing I'd like to do is, I'd like to mention that the

supporters of this program are about 15 percent of the industry. The other 85 percent of the industry is the industry that is trying to talk to you now. We've also been very heavy in the community support. A lot of us donate money, time and we've done this year after year and I would like to...I'd just like to let it be known that the open shop industry is opposed to this. I would appreciate your consideration and thank you for your time.

Greg Salts, 72 Kenney Street, stated I'm here to speak in favor of riverfront development. The slogan would be Riverfront Development and Economic Development especially with the increase in the taxes I think that's more reason to build it, to bring more business in Manchester. It would encourage out of city businesses to flock to Manchester. I don't know if the City would get money from advertising rights at the stadium or if that would belong to the owners of the baseball stadium, but I think advertising and vendor competition would almost pay for the bond. From what I understand the economic development package, aside from just the baseball stadium, the condos and the businesses coming down would basically pretty much pay for a bond, thus saving the taxpayer. As far as the building of the baseball stadium, I would hope that the condos would not block the downtown view and we can sit there and see the beautiful ambiance of downtown Manchester. Perhaps the third base side a little bit lower and the first base side a little bit higher so we can look over into the river. I think you're going to hear some people complaining about a baseball stadium being built, but a lot of them were the same people that were complaining about an ice rink being built. We all know it was more than an ice rink at the arena, and we also know that this baseball stadium is more than a baseball stadium. It is riverfront development. I've been to San Antonio, Texas and a few other riverfront developments and they were the most vibrant part of the city and I think we can have that here in Manchester. This is a huge step for that and I strongly encourage you to vote. As far as a referendum goes, that's up to you, but you were elected to make the tough decisions and I would hope that you would build this. Build it and they will come.

Jeff Kassel, 22 Appleton Street, stated I've been here before to, unlike Mr. Salts, to complain about the baseball stadium and the \$28 million that would have to be bonded to build it. And I think I've told this board that I had conducted my own poll and I did this months ago, and managed to find one person that was for it and tonight you've already heard the second person that I ran into that was for it. But according to the Union Leader there was a poll conducted, 400 people were polled in the City, that's what I've been told anyway, and the results were 38 percent opposed the idea of bonding the baseball stadium, 32 percent favored it, and 30 percent were undecided. Those are not my results when I conducted my poll; I conducted my poll in the whirlpool at the Y, there were very few women in that whirlpool so they were pretty much excluded. With these numbers I don't think it's going to go down very well with voters in this City that these Aldermen have decided that there wouldn't be a referendum on this project. What the people want counts. You're the elected representatives and you're supposed to carry out the will of the people. And as this was going through my mind, I became very angry about it. With 32 percent favoring a baseball stadium, I'm

wondering why we're moving forward with it and I've been toying with an idea for the last few months, I've been coming to this Aldermanic meeting getting my two minutes, complaining about the way money is spent in this City. My money, my taxes going the last 25 years from \$730 a year to \$4,000 a year. So I've decided to run for Mayor myself and I will get more of a chance to complain and try to define these issues in front of the public as much as I possibly can. So we're going to have four or five people in the mayoral contest, maybe more, but I'll be one of them.

Julie Todd, 962 Valley Street, stated I'm the Pastor of First United Methodist Church, which is at 961 Valley Street in Ward 7. I live right across the street at 962 Valley Street, which is Ward 5, so I represent a number of people. I'm also leader in the Granite State Organizing Project which you've heard referred to as GSOP and I serve as the co-chair of the employment team within GSOP and as such have been a part of the effort to reformulate and reintroduce the responsible employer ordinance to you tonight. I was not involved with the REO in any way, shape or form until I joined the employment team in October of this past year and so I don't carry with me the same baggage of what I heard was an antagonistic and adversarial, if you could call it a discussion or process, and the repeal of the REO last spring. And since October what I've seen is quite the opposite. I've been a part of multiple conversations between representatives of the business community, City leadership, union leaders, members of congregations, and community organizations coming together and respectful and honest dialogue and working across differences to create a new and revised ordinance for responsible contracting in the City of Manchester and in front of many of these people that said it's 100 percent better and that really is doable. The GSOP has worked hard to present this REO to you once again, and we have made substantial changes and compromises on the issues which were a problem before, about health insurance and training and enforcement. This is not a union issue. I am not a union member, I came here as a spiritual leader in the community who believes that it's a moral imperative of the community and their leaders to adopt policies which improve the common good and we're willing to assume responsibility for that common good, financial or otherwise. Language can still be discussed, so for goodness sake I urge you to support further discussion and adoption of this responsible employer ordinance. I thank you for your time and attention.

Joe Kelly Levasseur, 866 Elm Street, stated good evening Mayor, Aldermen. For informational purposes Mayor Baines does not have to accept the motion to reconsider the responsible employee friendly ordinance that will cost the taxpayers millions, so we'll see if he does tonight. It will be an interesting political move. I would like to caution this board against cutting the Police budget for the fourth year in a row. Their request as you've seen in the front page of the papers lately, gangs are scaring people to move out of the City, windows are being blown out all over commercial areas in downtown Manchester and the surrounding city, and crime seems to be getting worse. Four years in a row we're cutting those requests. I've noticed that things have been getting a little bit more dangerous in the downtown area. I think that Comcast is not the problem here in the City of Manchester, and

I hope you guys sign that deal. I think the problem is that the director of MCTV, the School District, and Mayor Baines do not want the people in this City to have a voice to speak except on Channel 96. There's plenty of room on Channels 16 and 22 for the rest of the City and we should just move and get everybody back to where they were before and we wouldn't have these ridiculous battles going on. I'm very worried about the fact that the amount of houses for sale are up in the City. In Saturday's paper there were three pages full and that's a lot. Tax rates are obviously going up and that's causing people to want to leave and I was very, very disconcerted to see that we have the highest poverty in the state. Considering some of our neighbors in the north who have had some really bad times. I thought that was a very bad omen for the City of Manchester. With a bad tuition deal and acrimony with Bedford, it doesn't seem like we're heading in the right direction on those two issues either. On the baseball petition, since the last two weeks, 200 more people have come in with petitions and I think you people have seen the polls and I would like somebody to make a motion to reconsider and send it to referendum. And for the last statement I would say, I would ask that somebody on this board would make a motion to support the parental notification bill that is being voted on in the Senate on Thursday and for people outside who are watching in I would like you to call Senator D'Allesandro who is against this very responsible and caring bill for the people of the City of Manchester. Thank you very much.

Eva Turgeon, 1600 Bodwell Road, stated I am here as a member of GSOP to request to you that you move forward the responsible employer ordinance. It protects the employees and it also protects the rest of the community, so I'm here to speak in favor of it. Please move it forward.

Carmen Ayala, 138 Pearl Street, stated thank you all for giving me this opportunity. I belong to the GSOP and to St. Adams Church. I've been involved in my community as a volunteer for ten years. I please ask you to move forward this ordinance because it would benefit the employers in the community and help with employment. Thank you.

Erica MacKillop, 73 Windward Lane, stated I am a member of the Granite State Organizing Project and also I am among the leaders of Grace Episcopal Church here in Manchester. My husband and I retired here in Manchester because we really felt there was a quality of life here that we did not find in other places. As a resident of Manchester I really think that I want to see this quality of life available to everyone in the city and that's why I believe that the responsible employer ordinance is a step in the right direction for this. I know workers, many contractors and many others agree that the problems this ordinance addresses are vitally important. The basic protection for workers, more training, and healthcare being available are definitely very important to quality of life here in our fair City and I think this ordinance is a good beginning toward this. Thank you.

Don Levasseur, 81 Poor Street, stated I've been a small businessman all of my life. I'm more of a concerned citizen tonight, this evening. I see this responsible employer ordinance and that rather bothers me and I didn't know that I had been an irresponsible employer in prior years. Obviously I have been according to this anyway. It bothers me somewhat that we have to sit down and have an ordinance to come to tell us how we're supposed to live our lives and run our businesses and stuff like that. I thought we lived in the United States of America where it was kind of a freedom that we had and we could run a business and if people don't like how we run our business, they don't have to work for us. Obviously that's not the case, I must be wrong. It says...I don't know who determines who is responsible and who is not responsible. I see this, and I'm reading this, and I'm sitting down and thinking well here there are going to be some more layers and layers and layers of expenses and costs to do something that we've been doing fine. I've never seen that there was a problem. I've never seen anybody come up to me and say there's a real problem here, some people aren't getting paid or their not getting paid what they're told they were going to get paid, so I missed the boat somewhere. I'm probably just not old enough and somehow or other it's just not gotten to me. Somebody came here, this lady just mentioned that she moved here because of the quality of life and I guess if there was nothing with the quality of life why are we trying to change it. Obviously I must be missing the boat. I'm not too sure. I went to Canada and my background is French Canadian and I feel sorry for them because it's socialistic employer and that's what happens there when you start determining who hires who and who pays what and what is done and what layers you do, and I really think we're going in the wrong direction altogether. I think we should let business people run a business. We should let the City fathers run the City and obviously you have enough complaints from everybody that obviously we're all going to be in the same boat. But anyway, I like the quality of life, I was born and brought up here in Manchester and I don't like government to tell me what I have to do, and I don't think the government should be sitting down and determining who is going to be responsible, who is not going to be responsible, and who is going to do all of the paperwork and who is going to get paid and who is going to serve it on somebody else's back. Anyway that's the way I feel about it. One other little thing, I'd like to kind of call a spade a spade. I think to look at this and to look in Massachusetts, I think a lot of it is background is union. Thank you very much.

Will Infantine, 89 Windward Lane, stated Mr. Mayor, Aldermen. First I'd like to thank you Your Honor as well as Aldermen Guinta, Garrity, and Mr. Clougherty for participating in that breakfast this morning for the Boys and Girls Club. It was very successful and I'd like to thank Alderman Guinta for contributing and for all of those who don't realize we're now on our 13th, you folks I've mentioned, we're all on our 13th hour of our business day so I appreciate you showing up this morning and I know it's a tight budget but please think fondly of the Boys and Girls Club when you're looking at your CIP budget this year. I speak to you tonight as a citizen as well as a member of the NH House. I hold in my hand over 50 postcards I received from the unions, people in Manchester, who wanted me to oppose

House Bill 821 and when I spoke to you folks two weeks ago I used the word consistency a number of times, and I'm asking for that tonight. The union came up and said this bill is not good, it hurts the unions. There were things in it that gave the non-union companies a leg up and I don't think that's right. I think it should be fair. Conversely, I do believe that this ordinance is slanted the other way and I don't think that's right either. In difference to my wonderful neighbor Dorothy, I know that the members of the Associated Builders and Contractors and the GSOP I think would be willing to sit down and come together, continue to work on a proposal that can then come back to this board, everyone being on the same page and vote for this. I have letters here thanking me for my vote from a number of the unions and I think it should be fair for everyone that...I refuse to vote on something that was unfair to one group and I would ask you folks not to vote for something that's unfair to another group. Thank you very much.

Timothy Oczykowski, 18 Old Coffeetown Road, Deerfield, stated I'm like a lot of people that live out of town, I own property in Manchester so I get to pay taxes, but I don't get to vote for any of you guys. My mother on the other hand does live here for the last 82 years. I'm against this responsible employer's act and it's just going to increase taxes on people that are retired on fixed incomes. I don't think it's fair.

Don Welch, 811 Dix Street, stated thank you Mayor Baines and members of the Aldermanic board. I come before you tonight and ask you to support a motion to send this particular responsible employer ordinance on to the Bills on Second Reading or whatever committee you deem necessary. I've been a member of the GSOP. I was one of the founding members of that organization and I'm quite impressed by it. They are looking at issues that affect this city and the people that live in this city, taxpayers in this city, and they've come up with a couple of good ideas. This responsible employer ordinance, my understanding the employment committee, went through this with the Associated Building Contractors, they came to some agreements, and there's probably still a few things that need to be tied up and I think the committee is the best place to do that. I wanted to dispel a couple of myths that you heard here tonight. People have come before this board and said tonight that this is going to be an increased cost to the taxpayers. Let me tell you something. I've sat on a committee for the last seven years; that happens to be in Massachusetts. It's the Insurance Fraud Bureau Unit in Massachusetts. When I was a State legislator I brought together the US Justice Department in New Hampshire, the State Attorney General's Office in New Hampshire, to a seminar down there. The pervasive cheating that goes on in the construction industry in this state is beyond belief. Now there are legitimate businesses out there, there are businesses that are deemed to be under this a responsible employer, I applaud them. I don't think one contractor would come forward tonight and have a problem with this if they were playing by the rules. It leaves an unfair competitive advantage for the people that do not pay workers compensation insurance, taxes, federal taxes, state taxes, and you know what? You know who is paying the bills around here? The taxpayer is. I can tell you just the opposite. If people come up here and say it's going to cost the taxpayers more money to

adopt this ordinance, I will say this, I will bring documentation to you people saying that this will save the taxpayers money and I can do that. Thank you very much and I hope you send this off to a committee.

Maureen Molly Lee Sherman stated I understand the library is getting budget cuts and the library is very important and I'm asking for the cuts to be taken back. I don't think there should be tag and bag of garbage and I don't think there should be a baseball stadium at Singer Park because Manchester can't afford it. And they're still talking about tag and bag of garbage and budget cutting the library and I think the charter from the Charter Commission should be voted on in November. Thank you.

Michael Lowry, 1005 Hanover Street, stated I am a carpenter and a responsible employee. I would like to speak on behalf of the responsible employer ordinance. I think you should send this to committee. Obviously it needs to be ironed out and it doesn't need to be killed. By the grace of God, I work for a responsible employer, I have insurance, I have a pension, my family is taken care of if anything happens to me. For many years I worked for irresponsible employers. I was 1099'd, had no insurance, and really was by the seat of my pants flying for life. All people need a fair shake in this city and we see some of these contractors come from outside of this city. For the people working who need the insurance, who need the pension, who need a better life are from this city. Thank you for your attention.

There being no one else present wishing to speak, on a motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Osborne, it was voted to take all comments under advisement and further to receive and file any written documentation presented.

This being a special meeting of the Board, no further business was presented and on a motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Smith, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk